



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,062	01/31/2002	James G. Bledsoe	25174A	2671
22889	7590	03/23/2005	EXAMINER	
OWENS CORNING			STAICOVICI, STEFAN	
2790 COLUMBUS ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GRANVILLE, OH 43023			1732	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,062

Applicant(s)

BLEDSOE ET AL.

Examiner

Stefan Staicovici

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 34-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-10, 42 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 34-41, 43 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendment filed January 5, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1, 9-10, 34 and 42 have been amended. Claims 13-33 have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-12 and 34-44 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-8, 11-12, 34-41 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 1, the newly added limitation of forcing the resin into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel "without the use of heat" does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although the original disclosure does not describe forcing the resin into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel "without the use of heat," the original disclosure does not explicitly exclude the use of heat.

In claim 34, the newly added limitation of evacuating substantially all air trapped between...the resin and the reinforcement panel through the perforations "without the use of heat" does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although the original disclosure does not describe evacuating substantially all air trapped between...the resin and the reinforcement panel through the perforations "without the use of heat," the original disclosure does not explicitly exclude the use of heat.

Claims 2-8, 11-12, 35-41 and 43-44 are rejected as dependent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 9-10 and 42 are allowed.
5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art does not teach or suggest a process for manufacturing a composite sheet including, applying at least one outer coat of material onto a mold surface, applying at least one coat of resin and reinforcement material over the outer coat to form a reinforcement layer, applying a perforated reinforcement panel to the reinforcement layer, forcing the resin into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel, thereby bonding the reinforcement layer and the reinforcement panel, wherein the perforating step is accomplished by moving the reinforcement panel through three sets of opposed pinch-rollers, one roller of a middle set of the three sets being a perforating mandrel having a plurality of perforating pins.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments filed January 5, 2005 have been considered.

Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, "a step wherein resin is forced into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel without the use of heat, thereby bonding the reinforcement layer to the reinforcement panel" (see pages 8-9 of the amendment filed 1/5/2005). However, this argument is drawn to a newly presented claim limitation not previously presented and as such, has been rejected in this Office Action as set forth above. Specifically, it should be noted that the newly added limitation of forcing the resin into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel "without the use of heat" does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although the original disclosure does not describe forcing the resin into the perforations formed in the reinforcement panel "without the use of heat," the original disclosure does not explicitly exclude the use of heat.

Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, "the use of a perforated panel where a vacuum pressure is used to force a resin into perforations formed...without the use of heat" (see page 9 of the amendment filed 1/5/2005). However, this argument is drawn to a newly presented claim limitation not previously presented and as such, has been rejected in this Office Action as set forth above. Specifically, it should be noted that the newly added limitation of evacuating substantially all air trapped between...the

resin and the reinforcement panel through the perforations “without the use of heat” does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although the original disclosure does not describe evacuating substantially all air trapped between...the resin and the reinforcement panel through the perforations “without the use of heat,” the original disclosure does not explicitly exclude the use of heat.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni, can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stefan Staicovici, PhD

Handwritten signature of Stefan Staicovici in black ink, with the date 3/24/05 written to the right.

Primary Examiner

AU 1732

March 20, 2005